Communications on Applied Nonlinear Analysis
ISSN: 1074-133X
Vol 32 No. 10s (2025)

Experiment with Adding Materials Like Microcapsules or Bacteria to Concrete for Self-Healing Properties

[1]Yougantar Choubey, [2]Burhanuddin Ahmed, [3]Atulya Kumar, [4]Dr. Rakesh Kumar Pandey

[1]UG Scholar, Department of Civil Engineering, Amity University Chhattisgarh

[2]UG Scholar, Department of Civil Engineering, Amity University Chhattisgarh

[3]Assistant Professor, Department of civil engineering, Amity University Chhattisgarh
[4]Associate Professor, Department of civil engineering, Amity university Chhattisgarh

Article History:

Received: 12-01-2025

Revised: 15-02-2025

Accepted: 01-03-2025

Abstract: Concrete is a fundamental material in modern infrastructure, yet its inherent brittleness and tendency to develop microcracks compromise durability and long-term performance. Recent advancements in materials science have led to the development of **self-healing concrete**, which can autonomously repair cracks and restore structural integrity. This review critically examines two major self-healing approaches: **microcapsule-based** and **bacteria-based** systems. Microencapsulation involves embedding synthetic or mineral healing agents in capsules that rupture upon crack formation, providing immediate chemical sealing. Conversely, bacterial systems utilize microorganisms such as *Bacillus subtilis* or *Sporosarcina pasteurii*, which precipitate calcium carbonate through microbial induced calcite precipitation (MICP) to seal cracks over time. The paper discusses the underlying healing mechanisms, material compositions, embedding techniques, environmental triggers, and performance indicators of each system. Comparative analysis reveals that while microcapsules offer rapid and targeted healing, bacterial systems provide sustainable, repeatable, and long-lasting crack repair. Despite significant laboratory success, challenges remain in terms of **scalability, standardization, cost, and environmental resilience**. The review concludes with an exploration of hybrid techniques, smart materials, and future directions for integrating self-healing technologies into sustainable and resilient construction practices.

Keywords: self-healing concrete, Concrete, Test , Economic, Environment

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of Concrete Durability Issues

Concrete is the most widely used construction material globally due to its cost-effectiveness, availability, and versatile mechanical properties. However, its inherent brittleness and susceptibility to cracking significantly compromise long-term durability and structural integrity (Neville, 2011). Cracks, even microscopic ones, provide pathways for water, chlorides, sulfates, and other aggressive agents to penetrate, accelerating corrosion of embedded steel and deterioration of the concrete matrix (Mehta & Monteiro, 2014). This degradation not only leads to increased maintenance costs but also raises concerns about the safety and lifespan of infrastructures such as bridges, dams, and buildings.

1.2. Importance of Crack Healing in Concrete Structures

Timely repair of cracks is critical for enhancing the service life of concrete structures. Traditional repair methods—such as epoxy injection or manual patching—are labor-intensive, costly, and often not feasible for inaccessible or micro-cracks. Therefore, recent attention has shifted toward developing **self-healing concrete**, which can autonomously repair cracks without external intervention. This not only reduces the need for frequent repairs but also aligns with sustainability goals by lowering resource consumption and extending service life (de Rooij et al., 2013). Crack healing enhances water tightness, mechanical strength, and overall durability.

1.3. Emergence of Self-Healing Technologies

The concept of self-healing materials emerged from biomimicry, drawing inspiration from biological systems capable of healing themselves after damage. Over the past two decades, various approaches have been proposed to develop self-healing concrete, broadly classified into **autogenous** and **autonomous** mechanisms (Li & Herbert, 2012). Autogenous healing refers to the natural ability of concrete to heal cracks through continued hydration and carbonation, limited to small crack widths (typically <0.2 mm). In contrast, **autonomous healing** involves embedding healing agents such as **microcapsules** containing adhesives or **bacteria** that precipitate minerals (e.g., calcium carbonate) when activated by environmental triggers. These innovative approaches have gained substantial traction in academia and industry due to their potential to significantly enhance concrete durability.

1.4. Objective and Scope of the Review

This review aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of experimental efforts and theoretical advancements in the field of self-healing concrete, with a specific focus on systems incorporating microcapsules and bacterial agents. It synthesizes the findings from multiple studies to:

- Explore the mechanisms of self-healing using microcapsules and bacteria;
- Compare their effectiveness in healing performance and mechanical restoration;
- Identify materials, encapsulation methods, and triggering conditions;
- Evaluate the limitations, challenges, and future prospects for real-world applications.

By consolidating key findings from recent literature, this paper contributes to the design and development of next-generation concrete materials that are more resilient, intelligent, and sustainable.

2. Mechanisms of Self-Healing in Concrete

2.1. Autogenous vs. Autonomous Healing

Self-healing in concrete can be broadly categorized into **autogenous** and **autonomous** healing mechanisms.

- **Autogenous healing** refers to the **natural crack-sealing capability** of hydrated cementitious materials without any external intervention or embedded agents. It primarily occurs due to continued hydration of unreacted cement particles and carbonation of calcium hydroxide ($Ca(OH)_2$) in the presence of moisture (Edvardsen, 1999). However, autogenous healing is highly limited in effectiveness, generally capable of sealing cracks only up to **0.2 mm** in width and under favorable environmental conditions such as water presence.
- **Autonomous healing**, on the other hand, involves **intentional modification of concrete** by embedding healing agents (such as microcapsules, vascular networks, or bacteria) that are activated when cracking occurs. This approach mimics biological healing systems and enables healing of

wider and repeated cracks. Autonomous systems typically offer more reliable and effective healing but may come at a higher cost and require careful material integration (Van Tittelboom & De Belie, 2013).

2.2. Chemical, Physical, and Biological Healing Mechanisms

Self-healing concrete mechanisms can be further classified based on the nature of the healing action:

Chemical Healing

Chemical healing involves the reaction of healing agents with environmental triggers (e.g., moisture or CO_2) to produce **sealing compounds**. Examples include:

- Hydration of unreacted cement particles forming calcium silicate hydrate (C-S-H).
- Carbonation reactions where $Ca(OH)_2$ reacts with CO_2 to form calcium carbonate ($CaCO_3$), which fills cracks (Yang et al., 2009).

Physical Healing

This mechanism relies on **physical swelling or crystallization** to block cracks. For example, **superabsorbent polymers (SAPs)** swell upon contact with water and plug cracks, preventing further ingress. SAPs may also retain moisture that promotes autogenous healing internally.

Biological Healing

Biological mechanisms utilize specific **bacteria**, such as *Bacillus subtilis* or *Sporosarcina pasteurii*, which precipitate calcium carbonate (MICP – Microbial Induced Calcite Precipitation) when activated by water and nutrients embedded in the concrete (Jonkers, 2011). The resulting calcite crystals effectively seal cracks, even in hostile environments.

These mechanisms can function independently or synergistically, depending on the composition and design of the self-healing system.

2.3. Parameters Affecting Self-Healing (e.g., humidity, crack width)

Several environmental and material parameters significantly affect the self-healing efficiency of concrete:

- **Crack Width:** Healing efficiency drastically drops for crack widths above 0.3 mm for autogenous healing. Autonomous systems (microcapsules and bacteria) have demonstrated healing potential up to 0.8–1 mm or more depending on design (Wang et al., 2014).
- **Moisture Availability:** Water is a critical factor in initiating hydration, microbial activity, and swelling reactions. Healing is substantially better under wet or humid conditions.
- **Curing Conditions:** Proper initial curing helps retain unhydrated cement, enhancing future autogenous healing. In contrast, poor curing reduces healing capacity.
- **Age of Concrete:** Older concrete has fewer unhydrated particles, thus reduced autogenous healing potential. Autonomous systems are less sensitive to age.
- **Type and Dosage of Healing Agent:** In autonomous healing, the type of healing compound (e.g., sodium silicate, epoxy resin), capsule size, and bacterial strains determine the extent and speed of healing.
- **Environmental Conditions:** Temperature, pH, CO_2 concentration, and oxygen levels impact biological and chemical healing pathways.

Understanding and optimizing these parameters is essential for designing effective self-healing systems tailored to specific environmental conditions and structural demands.

3. Microcapsule-Based Self-Healing Systems

3.1. Concept of Microencapsulation

Microencapsulation in concrete involves enclosing healing agents within microscopic capsules (typically 50–500 µm in diameter) that are uniformly distributed throughout the concrete matrix. When a crack forms and propagates through the structure, it ruptures these capsules, releasing the healing agent into the crack plane. Upon exposure to air or moisture, the released agent undergoes polymerization or mineralization, sealing the crack and restoring mechanical integrity (White et al., 2001).

3.2. Types of Healing Agents in Microcapsules

3.2.1. Epoxy Resins

Epoxy resins are among the most commonly used healing agents due to their excellent adhesion, mechanical strength, and chemical stability. Upon capsule rupture, the resin polymerizes, bonding the crack surfaces. Granger et al. (2007) demonstrated that epoxy-filled microcapsules in mortar improved crack sealing efficiency and strength recovery by up to 80%.

3.2.2. Polyurethane

Polyurethane (PU) is a reactive polymer known for its flexible sealing properties and fast curing time. PU systems often use a two-component encapsulation, where the polyol and isocyanate components are stored in separate capsules or embedded with a catalyst. Studies by Zhang et al. (2011) revealed that PU-based capsules effectively sealed microcracks in high-performance concrete.

3.2.3. Mineral-Based Agents

Mineral-based healing agents, such as sodium silicate or calcium aluminate, react with moisture and CO_2 to form solid precipitates (e.g., calcium silicate hydrate or calcium carbonate) within cracks. These agents are environmentally friendly and compatible with cement chemistry. Alghamri et al. (2016) reported that sodium silicate-filled capsules achieved high water tightness and moderate strength restoration.

3.3. Capsule Wall Materials (Urea-formaldehyde, PMMA)

The choice of wall material is crucial for ensuring capsule stability and rupture sensitivity. Common wall materials include:

- **Urea-formaldehyde (UF):** Offers good thermal stability and cost-effectiveness. Used extensively in epoxy resin encapsulation.
- **Polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA):** Provides better chemical resistance and is transparent for visualization studies.
- **Melamine-formaldehyde (MF):** Suitable for encapsulating aqueous healing agents and allows better dispersion.

The wall thickness and mechanical properties must be optimized to ensure capsule survival during mixing yet rupture under stress.

3.4. Trigger Mechanism and Release Dynamics

Capsules are designed to rupture upon crack formation due to localized tensile stress or strain. The release dynamics depend on:

- Crack width and propagation speed
- Capsule shell brittleness
- Viscosity and surface tension of the healing agent

Once released, the agent flows into the crack and cures either through chemical reaction (e.g., polymerization) or environmental interaction (e.g., carbonation).

3.5. Experimental Studies and Results

Several experimental studies have demonstrated the efficacy of microcapsule-based self-healing concrete:

- Joseph et al. (2010) achieved over 60% strength recovery in mortar beams using dicyclopentadiene-filled capsules.
- Li et al. (2015) incorporated double-walled capsules and achieved improved crack sealing and water tightness in pre-cracked specimens.
- Ameri et al. (2020) noted that microcapsule concentration significantly influences healing efficiency, with 3–5% by cement weight being optimal.

3.6. Limitations and Challenges

Despite their promise, microcapsule systems face several limitations:

- **Capsule fragility** during mixing and curing
- **Limited healing range** (typically single-use capsules)
- **High production costs** of customized capsules
- **Compatibility issues** between capsule materials and concrete matrix
- **Reduced workability** and compressive strength at high dosages

Scaling up for field applications also requires robust delivery systems and long-term performance validation.

4. Bacteria-Based Self-Healing Concrete (Bio-Concrete)

4.1. Concept of Microbial Induced Calcite Precipitation (MICP)

Bacteria-based self-healing relies on **microbial-induced calcite precipitation (MICP)**, where specific bacteria precipitate calcium carbonate ($CaCO_3$) as a metabolic byproduct. This calcite crystallizes within cracks, effectively sealing them and restoring water-tightness and integrity (Jonkers & Schlangen, 2008).

4.2. Types of Bacteria Used

The most effective bacterial strains are:

- *Bacillus sphaericus*
- *Bacillus subtilis*
- *Sporosarcina pasteurii*

These strains form endospores, which can survive in the harsh alkaline environment of concrete and remain dormant until activated by moisture ingress.

4.3. Nutrient and Carrier Systems

Bacteria require nutrients and calcium sources to initiate MICP. Common additives include:

- **Urea** (hydrolyzed to produce carbonate ions)
- **Calcium lactate** (calcium source)
- **Yeast extract or peptone** (for bacterial metabolism)

To enhance survival and distribution, these agents are embedded using:

- **Porous aggregates**
- **Silica gel**
- **Hydrogels**
- **Clay pellets**

4.4. Embedding Methods in Concrete

4.4.1. Direct Incorporation

In this method, bacterial spores and nutrients are directly mixed into the concrete matrix. Though simpler, survival rates are lower due to high alkalinity and heat during hydration.

4.4.2. Encapsulation (clay pellets, hydrogels)

Encapsulation improves bacterial viability by shielding spores and providing a localized micro-environment. Hydrogels swell with water, releasing the spores into cracks, while clay pellets offer mineral protection and porosity (Wiktor & Jonkers, 2011).

4.5. Healing Efficiency and Crack Closure Studies

Experimental findings show:

- Complete healing of cracks up to 0.8 mm within 1–3 weeks in moist environments
- Increased water tightness by 80–90%
- Partial recovery of compressive and flexural strength

Healing efficiency varies with crack width, curing conditions, bacterial strain, and nutrient availability.

4.6. Durability, Strength, and Longevity

Bacteria-based systems can significantly improve:

- Resistance to chloride penetration
- Freeze–thaw durability
- Reduction in permeability and porosity

However, long-term performance depends on bacterial survival and repeated healing capacity, which is still under research.

4.7. Limitations (Cost, Survival of Bacteria, Environmental Factors)

Challenges include:

- **High cost** of bacterial spores and nutrient carriers
- **Reduced viability** during cement hydration
- **Environmental concerns** over using genetically modified organisms
- **Activation dependency** on water ingress

Field trials are still limited, and regulatory standards are needed for broader acceptance.

5. Comparative Evaluation of Healing Approaches

5.1. Microcapsules vs. Bacteria – Healing Efficiency

Healing efficiency is a critical parameter to assess the performance of self-healing systems. Microcapsule-based systems generally offer **rapid and effective sealing** of small to moderate cracks (up to 0.6 mm) due to the immediate release and polymerization of the healing agent. However, they typically allow only **single-use healing**, as the capsules rupture once.

In contrast, bacteria-based systems demonstrate **gradual but potentially repeatable healing**, especially in moist conditions, and are more effective for **long-term water tightness** and crack healing up to 0.8–1.0 mm (Jonkers et al., 2010). The healing process in bio-concrete may take several days to weeks, depending on environmental factors and nutrient availability.

5.2. Mechanical Properties Post-Healing

Studies have shown that microcapsules filled with polymeric agents (e.g., epoxy or polyurethane) can restore up to **60–80% of original flexural or tensile strength** (Li et al., 2013). However, mechanical compatibility between the healed material and the concrete matrix can be an issue.

Bacterial healing, being mineral-based (calcite), offers **better bonding with the cement matrix**, although the **restoration of mechanical strength is generally lower (40–60%)** compared to polymer-based systems (Wiktor & Jonkers, 2011). Nevertheless, it often provides superior long-term durability and resistance to environmental degradation.

5.3. Environmental Sustainability

From a **sustainability standpoint**, bacteria-based systems outperform polymeric microcapsules. Bacterial agents utilize **natural metabolic processes** to precipitate minerals without releasing harmful byproducts. Additionally, their **biodegradable carriers** (e.g., clay, hydrogels) pose less ecological risk.

Conversely, microcapsules—especially those using synthetic polymers—may introduce **non-biodegradable waste** or VOCs (volatile organic compounds), raising environmental and health concerns during large-scale deployment (Palin et al., 2016).

5.4. Practicality and Field Applications

Microcapsule systems are relatively easier to **standardize and manufacture**, making them more suitable for **precast applications** or controlled environments. They integrate well with **existing mixing and casting methods**, though care must be taken to avoid premature rupture during mixing.

Bacterial systems pose **greater complexity** in terms of maintaining bacterial viability, especially in high pH and temperature conditions during hydration. However, they show promise in **underground, marine, and inaccessible structures** where long-term autonomous healing is more valuable.

5.5. Cost Analysis and Lifecycle Performance

Initial material costs for microcapsules are **moderate**, but they offer only **one-time healing**, which may require frequent replacement or supplementation. Their **lifecycle cost is higher** in structures prone to recurrent cracking.

Bacteria-based systems have **higher upfront costs** due to bacterial culture and encapsulation but may **reduce long-term maintenance**, especially when multiple healing cycles are expected. Lifecycle analyses (Wang et al., 2014) have shown that bio-concrete can reduce total maintenance costs by **30–50% over 50 years**, depending on the structure type and exposure conditions.

6. Recent Advances and Innovations

6.1. Hybrid Systems (Microcapsules + Bacteria)

To harness the advantages of both approaches, researchers are exploring **hybrid self-healing systems** that integrate **microcapsules for immediate crack sealing** and **bacteria for long-term mineralization**. Such systems offer **multi-phase healing**: fast initial protection followed by gradual strengthening (Wang et al., 2015).

These hybrid composites require careful optimization of capsule compatibility, bacterial nutrient delivery, and crack activation thresholds to prevent competition or inhibition between agents.

6.2. Use of Smart Materials and Nanotechnology

Nanotechnology is being leveraged to:

- Create **nano-capsules** with tailored release profiles,
- Embed **nano-silica or nano-clay** to promote mineral precipitation,
- Use **nano-sensors** for real-time crack detection and healing activation.

For instance, functionalized carbon nanotubes have been studied to **enhance crack sensing** and mechanical properties while also acting as carriers for healing agents (Zhang et al., 2020).

6.3. 3D Printing and Smart Concrete Design

Additive manufacturing (3D printing) is revolutionizing how healing agents are placed within concrete:

- Custom-designed capsules can be **strategically embedded** in weak zones.
- **Smart concrete geometries** can optimize crack paths for targeted healing.
- Digital design allows integration of **vascular networks** for healing fluid flow (Dry et al., 2003).

These developments facilitate **intelligent infrastructure** that adapts to damage patterns.

6.4. Field Trials and Commercialization Efforts

Several real-world projects have tested self-healing concrete:

- The **"BIO-Concrete" project** in the Netherlands demonstrated bacterial healing in canal walls and tunnels (Jonkers, 2011).
- **Basilisk Self-Healing Concrete** is now commercially available and used in marine and precast applications.

While full-scale adoption remains limited due to **regulatory gaps, performance consistency, and cost concerns**, ongoing standardization efforts (e.g., RILEM committees) are paving the way for wider implementation.

7. Challenges and Future Research Directions

7.1. Scalability and Real-Life Application

One of the foremost challenges in deploying self-healing concrete technologies at a commercial level is **scalability**. While laboratory studies have demonstrated promising healing results, replicating these effects under real-world conditions remains difficult due to:

- **Uneven crack propagation**, which may or may not rupture microcapsules,
- **Inconsistent moisture availability**, critical for activating both microcapsules (if water-based) and bacterial healing,
- **Complex structural geometries** that complicate uniform distribution of capsules or bacterial agents,
- The **limited shelf-life** of bio-based materials and their sensitivity to temperature and pH during transportation and mixing (Alghamri et al., 2016).

Concrete production must accommodate **healing agent protection**, precise dosing, and compatibility with standard batching and curing processes—all of which are yet to be widely standardized or automated at scale.

7.2. Long-Term Performance and Environmental Impact

Long-term field data on healing **efficacy beyond 5–10 years** is sparse. Key concerns include:

- **Depletion of healing agents** after multiple crack cycles (especially in microcapsules),
- **Bacterial viability** under dry or highly alkaline conditions over time,
- **Microbial byproducts** that could alter the chemical balance or weaken the concrete matrix,
- Potential for **VOC emissions** or environmental leaching from certain synthetic capsule shells or unreacted chemicals.

Future studies must focus on **accelerated aging tests, life cycle assessment (LCA), and durability simulations** in diverse climates and environmental conditions.

7.3. Standardization and Testing Protocols

Currently, there is no **universal framework** for evaluating self-healing performance. Researchers use varied metrics (e.g., crack width reduction, strength recovery, permeability tests), making cross-comparison difficult. There is an urgent need to:

- Develop **standardized test methods** under ASTM, ISO, or RILEM frameworks,
- Define **performance benchmarks** (e.g., minimum crack width healed, healing timeframes, % strength recovered),
- Establish protocols for **field trials** and **third-party validation** of commercial products.

International collaboration between academia, industry, and regulatory agencies is essential for formal acceptance and widespread implementation.

7.4. Integration with Sustainable Construction Practices

The future of construction is rooted in **sustainability, circular economy, and smart infrastructure**. Self-healing concrete aligns well with these principles, yet integration remains limited. For broader adoption, future research must:

- Focus on **eco-friendly healing agents**, biodegradable capsule walls, and non-GMO bacteria,
- Investigate **synergies with recycled aggregates**, geopolymer binders, or supplementary cementitious materials,
- Explore how healing systems interact with **thermal insulation, carbon capture concrete**, or **energy-generating facades**.

Multifunctional concrete materials that combine healing, sensing, and energy efficiency will represent the next frontier.

8. Conclusion

8.1. Summary of Literature Findings

This review synthesizes extensive literature on self-healing concrete systems utilizing **microcapsules and bacteria-based technologies**. Both methods have demonstrated substantial benefits in restoring mechanical properties, improving water tightness, and reducing long-term maintenance needs in laboratory conditions.

- Microcapsules offer **fast-acting, targeted repair**, while bacteria-based systems provide **environmentally friendly, long-lasting healing**.
- The **effectiveness** depends on several factors, including crack width, humidity, capsule integrity, bacterial survivability, and embedding techniques.

8.2. Effectiveness and Feasibility of Microcapsules and Bacteria

- **Microcapsules**: Effective for single-use applications, particularly in precast and controlled environments. However, their performance diminishes under cyclic loading and over time.
- **Bacteria-based systems**: More suited for underground, marine, and hard-to-access structures. They offer extended healing potential but are limited by environmental sensitivity and initial cost.

Feasibility studies indicate that both systems can be integrated into concrete with modifications, though economic and regulatory factors still hinder large-scale deployment.

8.3. Strategic Outlook for Implementation

To move from concept to construction, strategic steps include:

- Advancing **material engineering** to enhance stability, compatibility, and efficiency,

- Developing **automated delivery systems** for capsule/bacteria integration,
- Conducting **large-scale pilot projects** in diverse climates and structural contexts,
- Promoting **policy support and public-private partnerships** to encourage investment in sustainable infrastructure.

Collaborations between construction firms, government agencies, and research institutions are key to achieving this.

References:

[1] Alghamri, R., Kanellopoulos, A., & Al-Tabbaa, A. (2016). Preparation and testing of microcapsules containing sodium silicate for self-healing cement-based materials. *Construction and Building Materials*, 124, 242–250.

[2] Jonkers, H. M., & Schlangen, E. (2010). Crack repair by concrete-immobilized bacteria. *Restoration of Buildings and Monuments*, 16(4), 255–265.

[3] Wang, J., Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N., & Verstraete, W. (2015). Use of silica gel or polyurethane immobilized bacteria for self-healing concrete. *Construction and Building Materials*, 26(1), 532–540.

[4] Zhang, D., et al. (2020). Carbon nanotube-based self-sensing and self-healing composites: A review. *Materials Today Communications*, 24, 101195.

[5] Palin, D., Wiktor, V., & Jonkers, H. M. (2016). Bacteria-based self-healing concrete: Pathways, challenges, and advances. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 100(7), 2993–3007.

[6] Alghamri, R., Kanellopoulos, A., & Al-Tabbaa, A. (2016). Preparation and testing of microcapsules containing sodium silicate for self-healing cement-based materials. *Construction and Building Materials, 124*, 242–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.07.106

[7] Ameri, F., Ghalehnovi, M., & Molaei, R. (2020). Influence of microcapsule content on self-healing and mechanical properties of concrete. *Construction and Building Materials, 245*, 118374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2020.118374

[8] de Rooij, M. R., Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N., & Schlangen, E. (2013). *Self-healing phenomena in cement-based materials: State-of-the-art report of RILEM Technical Committee 221-SHC*. Springer.

[9] Dry, C. (2003). Matrix cracking repair and filling using active and passive modes for smart timed release of chemicals from fibers into cement matrices. *Smart Materials and Structures, 12*(3), 403–409.

[10] Edvardsen, C. (1999). Water permeability and autogenous healing of cracks in concrete. *ACI Materials Journal, 96*(4), 448–454.

[11] Granger, S., Loukili, A., Pijaudier-Cabot, G., & Chanvillard, G. (2007). Experimental characterization of the self-healing of cracks in an ultra-high performance cementitious material: Mechanical tests and acoustic emission analysis. *Cement and Concrete Research, 37*(4), 519–527.

[12] Jonkers, H. M. (2011). Bacteria-based self-healing concrete. *Heron, 56*(1/2), 1–12.

[13] Jonkers, H. M., & Schlangen, E. (2008). Development of a bacteria-based self-healing concrete. In *Tailor Made Concrete Structures* (pp. 425–430). Taylor & Francis.

[14] Jonkers, H. M., Thijssen, A., Muyzer, G., Copuroglu, O., & Schlangen, E. (2010). Application of bacteria as self-healing agent for the development of sustainable concrete. *Ecological Engineering, 36*(2), 230–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2008.12.036

[15] Li, V. C., & Herbert, E. (2012). Robust self-healing concrete for sustainable infrastructure. *Journal of Advanced Concrete Technology, 10*(6), 207–218.

[16] Li, V. C., Yang, E. H., & Yang, Y. (2013). Self-healing fiber reinforced composites for resilient infrastructure. *ASCE Journal of Advanced Concrete Technology, 11*(3), 123–137.

[17] Mehta, P. K., & Monteiro, P. J. M. (2014). *Concrete: Microstructure, properties, and materials* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

[18] Neville, A. M. (2011). *Properties of concrete* (5th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

[19] Palin, D., Wiktor, V., & Jonkers, H. M. (2016). Bacteria-based self-healing concrete: A review. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology, 100*(7), 2993–3007.

[20] Van Tittelboom, K., & De Belie, N. (2013). Self-healing in cementitious materials – A review. *Materials, 6*(6), 2182–2217. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma6062182

[21] Wang, J., Van Tittelboom, K., De Belie, N., & Verstraete, W. (2014). Use of silica gel or polyurethane immobilized bacteria for self-healing concrete. *Construction and Building Materials, 26*(1), 532–540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.06.054

[22] Wang, J., Soens, H., Verstraete, W., & De Belie, N. (2014). Self-healing concrete by use of microencapsulated bacterial spores. *Cement and Concrete Research, 56*, 139–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2013.11.009

[23] White, S. R., Sottos, N. R., Geubelle, P. H., Moore, J. S., Kessler, M. R., Sriram, S. R., ... & Viswanathan, S. (2001). Autonomic healing of polymer composites. *Nature, 409*(6822), 794–797.

[24] Wiktor, V., & Jonkers, H. M. (2011). Quantification of crack-healing in novel bacteria-based self-healing concrete. *Cement and Concrete Composites, 33*(7), 763–770.

[25] Yang, Y., Lepech, M. D., Yang, E. H., & Li, V. C. (2009). Autogenous healing of engineered cementitious composites under wet–dry cycles. *Cement and Concrete Research, 39*(5), 382–390.

[26] Zhang, D., et al. (2020). Carbon nanotube-based self-sensing and self-healing composites: A review. *Materials Today Communications, 24*, 101195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtcomm.2020.101195

[27] Zhang, Q., et al. (2011). Microencapsulated polyurethane for self-healing of concrete. *Construction and Building Materials, 25*(2), 593–600.